

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>		
	10/692,403		ABDO ET AL.		
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>		
	Rachel E. Beveridge		1725		

**All Participants:**

(1) Rachel E. Beveridge.

(2) David Maire (34,865).

**Date of Interview:** 14 September 2006

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 2 pm (EST)

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

102(b) as being anticipated by Burke et al. (US 6,325,871 B1).

Claims discussed:

1, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 12.

Prior art documents discussed:

Burke et al. (US 6,325,871 B1)

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet


  

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**JONATHAN JOHNSON**

**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the attorney for the applicant, David Maire, with regard to a possible examiner's amendment to better clarify the source of the grains which were claimed to be "nucleating in a molten region of the consumable insert..." The examiner and attorney agreed on the interpretation of the claim and substantive differences between the instant invention and prior art, and agreed on an examiner's amendment in order to better clarify applicant's invention and overcome the prior art. The prior art of record does not teach or suggest either alone or in combination cold working the surface of the substrate to a degree sufficient to cause grains nucleating in a molten portion of the consumable insert, joint, or second material during a transient liquid phase bonding process to grow into a substrate, and to a degree less than that which would cause recrystallization of the substrate at or below the bond temperature, to produce bond line grains having a size exceeding a thickness of the molten portion..